

Feb-01-05

03:56pm From:WoodcockWashburn

+2155683439

T-705 P.001/002 F-748



**FACSIMILE**

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 01 2005

**PHILADELPHIA**

One Liberty Place, 46th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
215-568-3100  
Fax: 215-568-3439

**SEATTLE**

999 Third Avenue, Suite 1606  
Seattle, WA 98104  
206-332-1380  
Fax: 206-624-7317

DATE: February 01, 2005  
**OFFICIAL PAPER**

JOB CODE: 535185

*Please deliver this and the following pages to:*

Examiner: **Fred Ehichioya**  
U.S.P.T.O. Group Art Unit: **2162**  
Telecopier No.: **571-273-4034**  
U.S. Serial No.: **09/783,820**  
Client/Matter No.: **MSFT-0232/160298.1**  
Sender's Name: **Peter M. Ullman**  
Pages to Follow: **1**

If transmission is not complete, please call our Philadelphia Office at (215) 568-3100.

COVER MESSAGE:

**OFFICIAL FACSIMILE. PLEASE DELIVER TO EXAMINER IMMEDIATELY.**

Attached hereto is/are the following documents:

- 1) Proposed agenda in 09/783,820

THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL AND EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAW. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, OR THE EMPLOYEE OR AGENT RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVERY OF THE MESSAGE TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY BY TELEPHONE AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL TO US AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS VIA THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE. THANK YOU.

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP  
A Partnership Including Professional Corporations  
[www.woodcock.com](http://www.woodcock.com)

Proposed agenda in 09/783,820

1. Proposed combination of Lerman and Pence does not teach timestamping a queue (claims 7 and 23). Examiner appears to agree that Pence teaches timestamping a request on a queue, not a queue itself. Examiner says that combination of Pence and Lerman nevertheless teach timestamping a queue, but has cited no portion of Lerman (or Pence) that supports this proposition. (See Office Action, pp. 6, 8).
2. Proposed combination does not teach organizing requests on a queue in increasing order of offset (claims 2, 16, 17, 18, and 24). The Examiner's argument is that an offset is a type of location, and that Lerman teaches "establishing priority" based on location. Even if one assumes that "establishing priority" is the same as organizing requests on a queue, the Examiner has applied the prior art backwards. A species anticipates (or renders obvious) a genus, not the other way around. The Examiner's position is that "offset" is a species of the genus "location," but the Examiner finds that Lerman's asserted teaching of "location" renders the more-specific "offset" to be obvious. This finding inverts the normal sense of how prior art is applied to a claim.
3. Proposed combination does not teach the queue per media feature (claims 1, 21, and 26-30). Applicants explained in the prior response that Lerman teaches certain queues that are associated with disk *drives*. Applicants explained why Lerman's teachings are properly understood to relate to disk drives, and the Examiner has responded by citing the dictionary definition of "disk" to show that a "disk" is a media. Showing what Lerman teaches by resorting to a dictionary, while ignoring what Lerman actually says, does not support the Examiner's position. Lerman clearly teaches that the queues relate to drives. The position that Lerman teaches a queue-per-media instead of a queue-per-drive is simply not supported by the response.